

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,782

Applicant(s)

MORIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on May 29, 2007.

Claims 1 and 7 has been amended.

Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gai (6167445) in view of Prager (5838918).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Gai teaches a communication setting management system for distributing communication characteristics setting to a plurality of communication entities connected to a network (Column 5, line 65 – Column 6, line 2), comprising:

a setting template entry/edit unit operated by a administrator to enter or edit a setting template that collects contents to be set for the plurality of communication entities connected to the network (Column 12, lines 21 – 30; Column 12, lines 6 – 9), with reference to information on a concrete method of setting the communication entities;

a setting template storing unit storing each setting template entered or edited by the setting template entry/edit unit as operated by the administrator (Column 8, lines 1 – 5);

an application rule entry/edit unit as operated by a administrator to enter or edit application rules prescribing rules of corresponding to the setting template, entered or edited in the setting template entry/edit unit operated by the first administrator, which is to be applied to a communication having a specific attribute (Column 12, lines 21 – 24);

an application rule storing unit storing each application rule entered or edited by entry/edit means; and

retrieval and response unit selecting, after the entering or editing the application rules by the administrator, an application rule from the application rule storing means in accordance with an attribute of a corresponding destination communication entity, reading from the setting template storing means a setting template having a setting template name specified by the selected application rule, and distributing the read setting template to the corresponding destination communication entity (Column 17, lines 64 – 67; Column 18, lines 24 – 42; lines 45 – 50; line 66 – Column 19, line 3, where the traffic manager controller on the intermediate device sends its configuration and capabilities to the policy server, the policy server applies device-specific filter to the policy information that has be made by the administrator which creates a policy for the specific device capabilities of the immediate device).

Gai does not explicitly indicate more than one administrator being able to perform separate functions.

Prager teaches a system for making templates to implement policies in a system (Column 5, lines 8 – 19). As part of Prager's system, he discloses that there are some more important global actions that only higher level authority administrators can perform, in comparison to lower level actions in which lower level authority administrators can perform (Column 11, lines 34 – 42; Column 13, lines 26 – 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Prager's teaching of having higher and lower authority actions in a template system to ensure only administrators with the proper high level authority are able to perform actions of more global performance and impact to protect the system from mistakes by lower level administrators.

Regarding claim 2, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 1, further comprising: setting template collective entering means for collectively entering a group of previously defined setting templates into the setting template storing means (Column 13, line 63 – Column 14, line 4).

Regarding claim 3, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 1, further comprising:

a plurality of management domains each having at least one communication entity (Column 6, lines 2 – 7), the management domains communicating via a network, and a communication setting management apparatus is disposed in each of the plurality of management domains (Column 10, lines 44 – 47); and

a corresponding management domain imparting on a management domain basis, a different communication characteristics settings to respective communications

between communication entities belonging to different management domains, each communication characteristics setting being managed on a corresponding management domain basis (Column 10, lines 38 – 47).

Regarding claim 5, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 3, further comprising:

a contradiction detection function unit for mutually interchanging information with a communication setting management apparatuses disposed in respective, different management domains, and detecting a contradiction between the information and the setting template and the application rule of its own management domain (Column 17, lines 33 – 44).

Regarding claim 6, Gai teaches the communication setting management system according to claim 5, further comprising:

a contradiction modification function unit for modifying a contradiction at the time when the contradiction is detected that a setting template or setting templates specified by the contradiction detection function unit according to the application rule to be the same, instead are not (Column 18, lines 32 – 35, where the policy translator handles conflicting roles and rules through priority).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the retrieval and response function unit is performed by the administrator in the prior art of record as opposed to after the administrators has performed all of his functions as seen in the amended claims. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 17, line 64 – Column 9, line 4, not depending on any steps of the administrator, the immediate device, or the routers of the system, upon their initialization automatically figure out their own capabilities, message the policy server those capabilities. The policy server then independent of any administrator, receives the capabilities, and performs a device-specific filter on the policy information stored at the server determines a device specific policy meant for the capabilities of the immediate device. This is all performed using the policy currently stored at the policy server, so it is clear that it happens after any administrators finalize the current policy for the system.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2155

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB
June 13, 2007



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER